

## United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/770,520	02/04/2004	Tomohiro Saito	05225.0259	1739
7	590 08/06/2004		EXAMINER	
Finnegan, Henderson, Farabow,			EVERHART, CARIDAD	
Garrett & Dunner, L.L.P. 1300 I Street, N.W. Washington, DC 20005-3315			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2825	

DATE MAILED: 08/06/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)	<del></del>
	10/770,520	SAITO ET AL.	
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Caridad M. Everhart	2825	A
The MAILING DATE of this communication a Period for Reply	appears on the cover sheet wit	h the correspondence addr	ess
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REF THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION  - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.  - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a r  - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory perions  - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by state that the period for reply will, by state that the material patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	N. 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a re reply within the statutory minimum of thirty od will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONT tute. cause the application to become AB/	ply be timely filed (30) days will be considered timely. HS from the mailing date of this comi	munication.
Status			
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on			
2a) ☐ This action is <b>FINAL</b> . 2b) ☑ Ti	his action is non-final.		
3) Since this application is in condition for allow closed in accordance with the practice unde		•	nerits is
Disposition of Claims			
4) ☐ Claim(s) 1-18 is/are pending in the application 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are with description 5) ☐ Claim(s) 3-5,9,12,14,16 and 18 is/are allowed 6) ☐ Claim(s) 1,2,6,8,11,13,15 and 17 is/are reject 7) ☐ Claim(s) 7 and 10 is/are objected to.  8) ☐ Claim(s) are subject to restriction and	rawn from consideration. ed. cted.		
Application Papers			
9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Exami	ner.		
10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a)☐ a			
Applicant may not request that any objection to the		• •	
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the			• •
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119			
a) All b) Some * c) None of:  1. Certified copies of the priority docume 2. Certified copies of the priority docume 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority docume application from the International Bure * See the attached detailed Office action for a list	ents have been received. Ents have been received in Apriority documents have been reau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	plication No eceived in this National St	age
Attachment(s)	_		
1) Motice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	4) Interview Su	mmary (PTO-413) /Mail Date. <u>07282004</u> .	
Paper No(s)/Mail Date		ormal Patent Application (PTO-1	52)

Application/Control Number: 10/770,520

Art Unit: 2825

٠ . و. سو

## Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham* v. *John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

- 1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
- 2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
- 3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
- 4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

Claims 1,2,6,8,11,13,15, and 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bashir, et al. (US 5,827,762) in view of Weiner (US 5,569,624).

Application/Control Number: 10/770,520

Art Unit: 2825

Bashir et al discloses the steps of Forming element isolation regions shown in Fig. 1(a) as field oxide regions. Gate oxide is also shown in Fig. 1(a). an impurity doped tungsten silicide layer is formed (col. 4, lines 36-50). The layer is patterned to form gates, and the source and drain regions are formed using the gates as mask((col. 5, lines 10-18). The gates also have sidewall spacers formed(Fig. 1(e)). Fig. 1(e) also shows extension regions formed.

Bashir et al is silent with respect to the irradiation step.

Weiner discloses that in the implantation of a metal silicide layer laser energy can be used to drive the implantation into the silicide(col. 5, lines 13-22).

It would have been obvious to one of ordnary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have used an irradiating step in the process taught by Bashir et al as taught by Weiner in order to drive the impurity to the portion of the silicide where it is desired.

## Allowable Subject Matter

Claims 3-5, 9, 12, 14,16,18 are allowed.

Claims 7, and 10 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Caridad M. Everhart whose telephone number is 571-272-1892. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Fridays 7:30-4:00.

Application/Control Number: 10/770,520 Page 4

Art Unit: 2825

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Matthew S. Smith can be reached on 571-272-1907. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

CARIDAD EVERHART PRIMARY EXAMINER

C. Everhart 6-28-2004